

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

PROTHERICS, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

**HON. DAVID J. KAPPOS,
Under Secretary of Commerce for
Intellectual Property & Director
of the United States Patent &
Trademark Office**

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:09-cv-01545-ESH

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR REMAND

Defendant the Honorable David J. Kappos, Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“Defendant” or “USPTO”), by and through undersigned counsel, respectfully moves the Court to remand the above-styled action to the USPTO for further proceedings. On May 5, 2010, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(m), counsel for Defendant, AUSA David C. Rybicki, contacted Plaintiff’s counsel, Lawrence Green, Esq., who indicated that he does not oppose the relief requested herein.

Plaintiff Protherics, Inc. (“Protherics”) brings this action against USPTO pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 145 and challenges the USPTO’s rejection of the invention claimed in U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/405,454 (“the ’454 Application”) as obvious in view of the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In its complaint, Protherics alleges it has new evidence not of record in the USPTO establishing the patentability of its claimed invention. See Complaint ¶ 24.

Having reviewed the prosecution history of the '454 Application along with Protherics' allegations regarding its new evidence in preparing to answer the complaint, the USPTO believes that remand to the agency is warranted. Remand will allow the agency to consider Protherics' new evidence in the first instance and to evaluate whether that new evidence establishes the patentability of Protherics' claimed invention. The USPTO therefore respectfully moves the Court to remand this case to the agency and to close the case administratively pending further proceedings in the agency.

Should the Court see fit, the USPTO also respectfully submits that it will provide the Court with a report regarding the status of the '454 Application within thirty (30) days of a final decision by the USPTO concerning the patentability of Protherics' claimed invention.

Dated: May 10, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

RONALD C. MACHEN JR., D.C. Bar #447889
United States Attorney
for the District of Columbia

RUDOLPH CONTRERAS, D.C. Bar #434122
Chief, Civil Division

BY: /s/ David C. Rybicki
DAVID C. RYBICKI, D.C. Bar #976836
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office
Civil Division
555 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
Phone: (202) 353-4024
Fax: (202) 514-8780

Of counsel:
JANET A. GONGOLA
FRANCES M. LYNCH

Associate Solicitors
Office of the Solicitor
United States Patent & Trademark Office

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PROTHERICS, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

HON. DAVID J. KAPPOS,
Under Secretary of Commerce for
Intellectual Property & Director
of the United States Patent &
Trademark Office

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:09-cv-01545-ESH

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Upon consideration of defendant's Unopposed Motion for Remand, and the record herein, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the joint motion BE, and it hereby IS, **GRANTED**; and it is further

ORDERED that the matter is administratively closed pending further proceedings in the agency; and it is further

ORDERED that this matter is **REMANDED** to the United States Patent and Trademark Office for further proceedings.

SO ORDERED this ____ day of _____, 2010.

ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE
United States District Judge